arXiv:1208.0258v1 [quant-ph] 1 Aug 2012

Uncertainty Relations in Viscous Dynamics and Quantum Dissipative Process

T. Koide[1] and T. Kodama[1,2,3]

[1]*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro,*
C.P. 68528, 21941-972, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
[2]*Frankfurt Institute for Advances Studies FIAS, ITP,*
Goethe-Universität Frankfurtm Ruth-Moufang-Str. 1, 60438 and
[3]*ExtreMe Matter Institute EMMI and Research Division,*
GSI Helmholzzentrum für Schwerionenforshung,
Planckstrasse 1, 64291 Darmstadt, Germany

The uncertainty relations in viscous dynamics and quantum dissipative processes were discussed within the scope of the stochastic variational method. We discussed how the momentum should be defined in these cases, and calculated relations corresponding to the Kennard inequality in quantum mechanics. We found that both of viscous dynamics and quantum dissipative processes have non-vanishing lower bound for the product of the mean-deviations of position and momentum. In particular, the Kostin equation was derived in SVM as quantized dissipative dynamics. It was found that its uncertainty relation differs from those obtained by another quantization theories of dissipative process by Kanai.

I. INTRODUCTION

The variational principle is one of the important guiding principles in physics, but its applicability is mostly restricted to conservative systems. For example, we can formulate the ideal fluid dynamics in terms of variational principle taking the dynamical variables as mass density and the fluid velocity. However, a Lagrangian constructed using these variables cannot describe the viscous behaviors. It is because dissipation is caused by collisions among constituent molecules of fluids, whose information is not included in the Lagrangian. To introduce the effect of such internal unspecified degrees of freedom, the framework of the variational method must be extended. One of the well-known methods to include the dissipative phenomena is that of Rayleigh's dissipation function method, where a new term representing the energy transfer process between the microscopic and macroscopic degrees of freedom is introduced in the Lagrangian, but the original structure of variational principle has to be modified.

The stochastic variational method (SVM) is an alternative approach to deal with such a situation [1–11]. In this approach, dynamical quantities are replaced with the corresponding stochastic variables so that the effect of the unspecified degrees of freedom such as molecular motions in fluids is taken into account through the fluctuation of the dynamical variables.

This method was originally proposed to re-formulate Nelson's stochastic quantization [5] from the variational framework, but it has shown also to be applicable to derive the Navier-Stokes equation [6, 7], the Gross-Pitaevskii equation [7, 8] and the Kostin equation [9]. That is, in SVM, two different systems such as the Schrödinger equation and the classical dissipative fluid motion can be described in a unified way. In fact, it was already pointed out a long time ago by Madelung [12–14] that the Schrödinger equation can be cast into the form of Euler's equation for ideal-fluid dynamics. Thus SVM will have an ample applicability and is a very promising method to deal with the dissipative/stochastic phenomena.

In spite of this, the SVM approach as a quantization method has not yet been established compared to the standard canonical formulation. For example, in SVM, the canonical momentum is not defined and hence the formulation of the uncertainty relation has not been discussed. In the canonical quantization scheme, the uncertainty relation is a direct consequence of the commutation relation between the position and momentum operators. Therefore, to understand the relation between the standard quantization method and SVM, the proper definition of momentum in SVM is necessary. In addition, since SVM can deal in both quantum and classical fluctuations in the unified way, it will be also possible to discuss the correspondence between quantum mechanics and viscous hydrodynamics in terms of the uncertainty relation.

Furthermore, the formulation of the uncertainty relation in SVM is practically important, because the uncertainty relation is one of important criteria to see whether a system is quantized correctly when the dynamical variable does not correspond to the elementary degree of freedom such as collective motion. Such a situation appears when we quantize classical dissipative systems [15–19]. The application of the usual canonical quantization to this case sometimes leads to the uncertainty relation which disagrees with our experience

[17]. To the best knowledge of the authors, the consistency between the uncertainty relation and the quantization of dissipative processes is still an open issue. In fact, because of this inconsistency, it is considered that the quantized equation of classical dissipative dynamics cannot be a candidate to describe quantum dissipative phenomena [20]. So far, the quantum dissipation have exclusively been discussed as the effect of coarse-grainings of degrees of freedom in a quantum mechanical many-body problem.

On the other hand, SVM is formally applicable to the quantization of the dissipative system, once its classical equation of motion is formulated in the framework of the variational principle by introducing an external time-dependent factor in the Lagrangian. Such a procedure was investigated by Misawa [9] and the resultant equation is different from that of the canonical quantization by Kanai [18]. The derived equation by Misawa in SVM is equivalent to the so-called Kostin equation [15]. As was mentioned, SVM does not introduce the canonical momentum. Furthermore, since the Kostin equation is non-linear, a straight forward discussion for the uncertainty relation using the linear algebra is not clear. To verify the physical plausibility of the Kostin equation obtained in this form, it is necessary to check the validity of the uncertainty relation.

In this paper, we show that the stochastic variational method (SVM) proposed by Yasue [1–7] (See also the list of references in Ref. [7]) furnishes a possible way to define the momentum applicable to viscous dynamics and quantum dissipative processes. The original formulation of SVM and its application has been based on the Lagrangian, we can reformulate the SVM into the Hamiltonian form through the Legendre transform, introducing the canonical momentum to the position [10]. We show that these canonical variables then satisfy the uncertainty relation which reproduces the Kennard inequality in quantum mechanics as a special case. We further discuss the uncertainty relation of the Kostin equation [15]. We find that this quantum dissipative theory has a finite uncertainty, differently from the quantum dissipative dynamics by Kanai [18].

The formulation of the uncertainty relation in the stochastic formulation of quantum mechanics was already discussed in Ref. [21] where, however, SVM was not applied. Our work is an extension of this result in the framework of SVM.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we develop the formulation of SVM based on the Hamiltonian and introduce the definition of momentum in this formulation. By using this definition, we derive the uncertainty relation for viscous dynamics in Sec. III.

The uncertainty relation of the quantum dissipative process is discussed in Sec IV. Section V is devoted to concluding remarks.

II. STOCHASTIC VARIATIONAL METHOD

Here we discuss the formulation of SVM. Usually, SVM is formulated based in the Lagrangian form. However, to define momentum, we need to re-formulate this scheme in the Hamiltonian form with care, due to the presence of two different velocity fields in SVM. This approach is the generalization of the discussion in Ref. [10].

A. Two velocity fields

We start from the stochastic differential equation (SDE) to represent a trajectory of a particle or an element of a continuum medium. In the variational procedure, the initial and final positions of the trajectory are fixed. Corresponding to this, we consider the stochastic process where an initial and a final distributions are fixed. The Bernstein process, for example, is a stochastic process corresponding to this situation. However, we do not discuss this point in the present paper and simply assume the existence of the appropriate probability space satisfying the σ-algebra for our stochastic dynamics. More intuitively, stochastic trajectories are not smooth and there are two different definitions for the time derivatives of a trajectory. These time derivatives are characterized by introducing the two SDEs. See also discussion in Refs. [6, 7].

One of the two SDEs describes a stochastic process forward in time, which is defined by

$$d\mathbf{r}(t) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t)dt + \sqrt{2\nu}d\mathbf{W}(t) \quad (dt > 0), \tag{1}$$

where ν is the strength of the noise and we assume that the noise $d\mathbf{W}(t)$ is defined by the Wiener process,

$$E\left[W_j(s) - W_j(u)\right] = 0, \tag{2}$$

$$E\left[(W_j(s) - W_j(u))(W_k(s) - W_k(u))\right] = \delta^{jk}|s-u|, \tag{3}$$

$$E\left[(W_j(s) - W_j(u))W_k(t)\right] = 0. \tag{4}$$

In the following discussion, to distinguish the variables of the position of a particle (trajectory) from the general (spatial) coordinate, we use the character $\mathbf{r}$ for the former and $\mathbf{x}$ for the latter. Of course, the variable $\mathbf{r}$ is always a function of time, $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}(t)$, but we suppress the argument to simplify the notation, except when we emphasize it.

The other SDE represents a stochastic process backward in time,

$$d\mathbf{r}(t) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{r}, t)dt + \sqrt{2\nu}d\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(t) \quad (dt < 0), \tag{5}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(t)$ is, again, the Wiener process,

$$E\left[\tilde{W}_j(s) - \tilde{W}_j(u)\right] = 0, \tag{6}$$

$$E\left[(\tilde{W}_j(s) - \tilde{W}_j(u))(\tilde{W}_k(s) - \tilde{W}_k(u))\right] = \delta^{jk}|s - u|, \tag{7}$$

$$E\left[(\tilde{W}_j(s) - \tilde{W}_j(u))\tilde{W}_k(t)\right] = 0. \tag{8}$$

There is no correlation between $\mathbf{W}(t)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(t')$. We assume that both of $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ are smooth functions of $\mathbf{x}$ and t.

For Eq. (5) to represent the time reversed process of Eq. (1) in the sense of probability, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\mathbf{u}$ cannot be independent. The relation of these functions is derived from the consistency of the two Fokker-Planck equations for the particle density ρ obtained from the forward and backward SDEs, respectively [7]. Since the two Fokker-Planck equations must be same, the following consistency condition should be satisfied,

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, t) + 2\nu\nabla \ln \rho(\mathbf{x}, t). \tag{9}$$

Correspondingly to the two SDEs, the two different definitions of the time derivative [5] are available: one is the mean forward derivative,

$$D\mathbf{r}(t) = \lim_{dt \to 0+} E\left[\left. \frac{\mathbf{r}(t + dt) - \mathbf{r}(t)}{dt} \right| \mathcal{P}_t \right], \tag{10}$$

and the other the mean backward derivative,

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{r}(t) = \lim_{dt \to 0+} E\left[\left. \frac{\mathbf{r}(t) - \mathbf{r}(t - dt)}{dt} \right| \mathcal{F}_t \right]. \tag{11}$$

Here $E[F(t')|\mathcal{P}_t]$ denotes the conditional average of a time sequence of stochastic variables $\{F(t'), t_a < t' < t_b\}$ only for $t' > t$, fixing the values of $F(t')$ for $t' \leq t$ [5]. Similarly, $E[F(t')|\mathcal{F}_t]$ is the conditional average for the past sequence. For the σ-algebra of all measurable events of r, $\{P_t\}$ and $\{F_t\}$ represent an increasing and a decreasing family of sub-σ-algebras, respectively [3].

In the present case, because of Eqs. (1) and (5), we obtain

$$D\mathbf{r}(t) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t), \qquad \tilde{D}\mathbf{r}(t) = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{r}, t). \tag{12}$$

The objective of SVM is to determine this unknown function $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ (or equivalently $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$) by the variation procedure from a given action.

B. Definition of action

In Ref. [7], two different actions are discussed; one is a particle system and the other continuum media. In order to discuss viscous dynamics, here, we consider the action of continuum media. In this picture, a continuum medium is regarded as the ensemble of fluid elements, and the variational method gives dynamics (trajectories) of these elements.

Let us first consider the continuum medium described by the following the classical Lagrangian [6, 7],

$$L = \int d^3\mathbf{R}\rho_m^0(\mathbf{R}) \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R}, t)}{dt} \right)^2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho_m(\mathbf{r}, t)} \right], \tag{13}$$

where ε is the internal energy density of media (fluid) and assumed to be a differentiable function of the mass density ρ_m. Note that the integral is over the initial position R of the fluid elements with the mass distribution $\rho_m^0(R)$. The Lagrange coordinate $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R}, t)$ denotes the trajectory of a fluid element specified by its initial position $\mathbf{R}$. Assuming that there is no turbulence, the initial and posterior mass densities $\rho_m^0(\mathbf{R})$ and $\rho_m(\mathbf{r}, t)$ are related to through the relation

$$\rho_m(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{1}{J}\rho_m^0(\mathbf{R}), \tag{14}$$

where the Jacobian J is

$$J = \det|\partial\mathbf{r}/\partial\mathbf{R}|. \tag{15}$$

The application of the classical variational method, where $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R}, t)$ is a smooth function of t, to this action leads to the usual Euler equation [6].

In SVM, we have to replace the classical trajectory $\mathbf{r}$ by the stochastic one and thus the action is defined by the expectation value,

$$I = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt \int d^3\mathbf{R}\ E\left[\mathcal{L}\right] \tag{16}$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is the stochastic generalization of the classical Lagrangian density in Eq.(13). To obtain this, we employ the condition that the stochastic Lagrangian reduces to the classical one in the limit of vanishing noise $\nu = 0$. Even though, we note that, due to the existence of two different time derivatives in SVM, the stochastic generalization is not unique. To construct the stochastic correspondent term to the classical kinetic term $(d\mathbf{r}/dt)^2$, there are three possibilities: $(D\mathbf{r})^2$, $(\tilde{D}\mathbf{r})^2$ and $(D\mathbf{r})(\tilde{D}\mathbf{r})$. Then the most general expression is given by the linear combination of them [30]. In short, the most general expression of the stochastic Lagrangian density is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \frac{\rho_m^0}{2}\left[\left(\frac{1}{2}+\alpha_2\right)\left\{\left(\frac{1}{2}+\alpha_1\right)(D\mathbf{r}(t))^2+\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha_1\right)(\tilde{D}\mathbf{r}(t))^2\right\}+\left(\frac{1}{2}-\alpha_2\right)(\tilde{D}\mathbf{r}(t))(D\mathbf{r}(t))\right] \\ &\quad -\rho_m^0\frac{\varepsilon}{\rho_m}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where α_1 and α_2 are arbitrary real constants. In fact, in the vanishing noise limit, the difference between $D\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R},t)$ and $\tilde{D}\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R},t)$ disappears,

$$\lim_{\nu\to 0} D\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R},t) = \lim_{\nu\to 0} \tilde{D}\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R},t) = d\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R},t)/dt, \tag{18}$$

and hence, independently of the values of α_1 and α_2, the stochastic Lagrangian density (17) always reproduces the corresponding classical one. As we will see below, dynamics obtained by SVM strongly depends on the choice of these parameters α_1 and α_2 [7]. For systems with time reversal symmetry such as the Schrödinger or Gross-Pitaevskii Equation, we should set $\alpha_1 = 0$, while viscous dynamics like the Navier-Stokes equation is obtained when $\alpha_1 \neq 0$.

It should be noted that the Jacobian J, for example, contains the derivative of $\mathbf{r}$ with respect to $\mathbf{R}$. Then we should replace the classical variable to the stochastic one only after implementing all such a derivatives.

C. Stochastic variation in Hamiltonian form

The discussions developed so far are sufficient to implement the stochastic variation. To discuss the uncertainty relation, however, we have to introduce the Hamiltonian density.

In this scheme, the momentum is introduced through the Legendre transform of the Lagrangian density. From the general expression (17), the stochastic Lagrangian density is a function of $\mathbf{r}$, $\mathbf{u} = D\mathbf{r}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \tilde{D}\mathbf{r}$. Let us introduce the Legendre transformation to change the latter two variables $(\mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}})$ into $(\mathbf{p}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}})$ introducing the Hamiltonian density,

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) \equiv \frac{\rho_0}{2} (\mathbf{p}\mathbf{u} + \bar{\mathbf{p}}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) - \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}). \tag{19}$$

In the above, ρ_0 represents the initial number density, $\rho_0 = \rho^0_m/m$ with m the mass of a constituent particle of fluids (continuum media). From the procedure of the Legendre transform, $\mathbf{p}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{p}}$ are given by

$$\frac{\rho_0(\mathbf{R})}{2}\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{R}, t) \equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \mathbf{u}} = \rho^0_m(\mathbf{R}) \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha_1\right) \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2\right) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{r}, t) \right\}, \tag{20}$$

$$\frac{\rho_0(\mathbf{R})}{2}\bar{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{R}, t) \equiv \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{u}}} = \rho^0_m(\mathbf{R}) \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha_1\right) \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2\right) \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{r}, t) \right\} \tag{21}$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p} \\ \bar{\mathbf{p}} \end{pmatrix} = 2mM \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{22}$$

where M is the (2×2) matrix defined by

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2\right)\left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha_1\right) & \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2\right) \\ \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha_2\right) & \left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2\right)\left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha_1\right) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{23}$$

When M is non-singular, that is, $\det M \neq 0$, we can eliminate $\mathbf{u}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ in terms of $\mathbf{p}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{p}}$ and the Hamiltonian density is expressed as

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) = \frac{\rho^0_m}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2m}\right)^2 \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p} & \bar{\mathbf{p}} \end{pmatrix} M^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p} \\ \bar{\mathbf{p}} \end{pmatrix} + \rho^0_m \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho_m} \tag{24}$$

To implement the stochastic variation in the Hamiltonian form, we re-express the action as

$$I\left[\{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}\}\right] = \int_{t_a}^{t_b} dt \int d^3\mathbf{R} E \left[\rho_0 \frac{\mathbf{p}D\mathbf{r} + \bar{\mathbf{p}}\tilde{D}\mathbf{r}}{2} - \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}) \right]. \tag{25}$$

where $\mathbf{p}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ are now other stochastic functions of $\mathbf{R}$ and t and the results (20) and (21) should be reproduced after the variation. Here, $\{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}\}$ denotes the whole set of stochastic functions, and one particular event of them is denoted by $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{R}, t), \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{R}, t)$ and $\mathbf{p}(\bar{\mathbf{R}}, t)$. Then we require $\delta I = 0$ with respect to the variations,

$$\mathbf{r} \to \mathbf{r} + \delta h_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}, t), \tag{26}$$

$$\mathbf{p} \to \mathbf{p} + \delta h_{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{R}, t), \tag{27}$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{p}} \to \bar{\mathbf{p}} + \delta h_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{R}, t), \tag{28}$$

where $\delta h_{\mathbf{r}}$, $\delta h_{\mathbf{p}}$ and $\delta h_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}}$ are arbitrary smooth functions of $\mathbf{R}$ and t defined for each event, satisfying the boundary condition,

$$\delta h_i(i, \mathbf{R}, t_{a(b)}) = 0 \qquad (i = \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}, \bar{\mathbf{p}}). \tag{29}$$

The result is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2m} M^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p} \\ \bar{\mathbf{p}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{30}$$

$$\left[\frac{\tilde{D}\mathbf{p} + D\bar{\mathbf{p}}}{2} + \frac{m}{\rho_m} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \left(- \frac{d}{d(1/\rho_m)} \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho_m} \right) \right]_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{r}} = 0, \tag{31}$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}$ represents the usual derivative with respect to $\mathbf{x}$. The first equation give the definition of $\mathbf{p}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ as stochastic variables and is exactly the same as Eq. (22). The last equation corresponds to the stochastic version of Newton's equation of motion. Note that parameters α_1 and α_2 do not explicitly appear in this equation. These parameters affect only the definitions of momenta (30). This fact is important when we discuss the uncertainty relation.

By eliminating $\mathbf{p}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ from Eq. (31) using Eq. (22) and employing that Eq. (31) is satisfied for all possible trajectories, we recover the corresponding equation in the Lagrangian formalism [7]. By using the physical velocity, $\mathbf{u}_m = (\mathbf{u} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}})/2$ which is parallel to the mass flow [7], Eq. (31) is re-expressed as

$$\rho_m \left(\partial_t + \mathbf{u}_m \cdot \nabla \right) \mathbf{u}_m - \nabla \cdot (\mu \rho_m \widehat{E}) - 2\kappa \rho_m \nabla \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_m}} \nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho_m} \right) = -\nabla P, \tag{32}$$

where $\mu = \alpha_1(1 + 2\alpha_2)\nu$, $\kappa = 2\alpha_2\nu^2$ and $\widehat{E}$ is a symmetric 3×3 tensor formed by the velocity gradients, $\widehat{E} = \{e_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, t)\} = \{\partial_j \mathbf{u}_m^i(\mathbf{x}, t) + \partial_i \mathbf{u}_m^j(\mathbf{x}, t)\}$ and P is the pressure defined as $P = {\rho_m}^2 d(\varepsilon/\rho_m)/d\rho_m$. In the above, the notation $(\nabla\cdot)$ represents the contraction of the vector operator ∇ with one of the indices of the tensor. We observe that when we set the parameter $\alpha_2 = 0$ (equivalently, $\kappa = 0$), the above equation reduces to the Navier-Stokes equation [31].

As discussed in Ref. [7], $\alpha_1 = 0$ contains the quantum mechanical case. In this case, the third term comes from the so-called quantum potential in Bohm's interpretation of quantum mechanics [12, 14], and seems to give even the surface term in the Thomas-Fermi-Weizsäcker approximation in the quantum mechanical many-body problem. Even for $\alpha_1 \neq 0$, that is, when the time reversal symmetry is violated [7], we still can consider this as a kind of correction term in hydrodynamics [6, 7]. In fact, this term plays an important role to discuss diffusion processes in SVM [7]. It is also worth mentioning that, recently, the same correction to hydrodynamics was reproduced with a different phenomenological argument [22].

D. Several remarks on stochastic Hamiltonian formulation

In this subsection, we summarizes several remarks for the formulation based on the stochastic Hamiltonian density. The kinetic part of the Lagrangian, apart from the factor $\rho_m^0/2$,

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} & \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \end{pmatrix} M \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{33}$$

In the basis where M is diagonal, we can write

$$K = \lambda_1 \mathbf{U}_1^2 + \lambda_2 \mathbf{U}_2^2, \tag{34}$$

where U_i is given by the linear combination of $\mathbf{u}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$, and λ_i is the solution of the equation,

$$\lambda_i^2 - \lambda_i \mathrm{Tr}\ M + \det M = 0. \tag{35}$$

When the two parameters α_1 and α_2 satisfy the relation,

$$(2\alpha_2 + 1)\,\alpha_1 = \pm\sqrt{2\alpha_2}, \tag{36}$$

the matrix M becomes singular and we cannot introduce the momenta. In fact, when this condition is satisfied, one of λ_i vanishes and the kinetic energy part in Eq.(17) can be written as a perfect square of a linear combination of $\mathbf{u}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$,

$$K = \lambda_i \mathbf{U}_i^2. \tag{37}$$

That is, the stochastic Lagrangian density essentially contains one linear combination of $D\mathbf{r}$ and $\tilde{D}\mathbf{r}$, as if only one effective degrees of freedom is participating to the dynamics. Thus in this case, we cannot introduce the two momenta.

If we require that the contribution from the kinetic energy to be positive for any velocity $D\mathbf{r}$ and $\tilde{D}\mathbf{r}$, the two eigenvalues should be both positive. From the well-known second order algebra, the necessary and sufficient condition for the positive roots for Eq. (35) is

$$\mathrm{Tr}\ M > 0 \ \text{ and } \ \det\ M > 0, \tag{38}$$

which demands $\alpha_2 > 0$ and

$$\alpha_1 < \frac{\sqrt{2\alpha_2}}{2\alpha_2 + 1}, \tag{39}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mu < \sqrt{\kappa}. \tag{40}$$

The maximum value of α_1 is $1/2$ when α_2 is $1/2$, and in this case M is singular.

From this analysis, we see that the correction term proportional to κ in the Navier-Stokes equation is necessary to have a positive definite kinetic term. In other words, the exact Navier-Stokes equation where $\kappa = 0$ does not have a positive definite kinetic term in the framework of SVM.

Here we introduced the Hamiltonian through the Legendre transform. From the Noether theorem, however, it is known that the Hamiltonian can be derived also from the translational invariance for time. This is true even for the stochastic Hamiltonian. The Noether theorem of SVM is developed in Ref. [11].

III. UNCERTAINTY RELATION

The mean-deviation of the position of a fluid element due to fluctuation is defined uniquely by

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{E[(\mathbf{r} - E[\mathbf{r}])^2]}. \tag{41}$$

On the other hand, because of the two different momenta, the definition of the mean-deviation for the momentum is not trivial in SVM. Here we define it by the symmetric average of the two momenta as,

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{p}} \equiv \frac{1}{\int d^d\mathbf{x}\rho}\sqrt{\frac{E[(\mathbf{p} - E[\mathbf{p}])^2] + E[(\bar{\mathbf{p}} - E[\bar{\mathbf{p}}])^2]}{2}}. \tag{42}$$

where d denotes the spatial dimension. Here we used the normalization factor $\int d^d\mathbf{x}\rho$ which is necessary to discuss the uncertainty relation for many-body systems where $\int d^d\mathbf{x}\rho \neq 1$. See also the discussion in Appendix A.

There is a possibility that the mean-deviation for the momentum is given by the asymmetric combination of $E[(\mathbf{p} - E[\mathbf{p}])^2]$ and $E[(\bar{\mathbf{p}} - E[\bar{\mathbf{p}}])^2]$ as was done in the stochastic representation of the Lagrangian density. However, as was shown in Eq. (31), the asymmetry appears only in the definitions of the momenta. That is, once a quantity is expressed using the momenta, the expression is symmetric for $\mathbf{p}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the definition given by Eq. (42) is applicable to any α_1 and α_2.

Now, using the following inequality valid for real stochastic variables $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ in $\mathbf{R}^d$ [32]

$$E[\mathbf{A}^2]E[\mathbf{B}^2] \geq |E[\mathbf{AB}]|^2, \tag{43}$$

and Eq. (22), we obtain, after some algebra,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}\Delta_{\mathbf{p}} &\geq \sqrt{\left(1+\left(\frac{\mu}{\nu}\right)^2\right)\left(mE[(\mathbf{r}-E[\mathbf{r}])\cdot(\mathbf{u}_m - E[\mathbf{u}_m])] - md\frac{\mu(\kappa+\nu^2)}{\nu^2+\mu^2}\right)^2 + m^2d^2\frac{(\kappa-\mu^2)^2}{\nu^2+\mu^2}} \\ &\geq \frac{4md\nu^2}{\sqrt{\nu^2+\mu^2}}|\det\, M|, \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where $\det M$ is defined using the matrix of Eq. (23),

$$\det\, M = \frac{\alpha_2}{2} - \alpha_1^2\left(\frac{1}{2}+\alpha_2\right)^2 = \frac{\kappa-\mu^2}{4\nu^2}. \tag{45}$$

This is the uncertainty relation between the position and momentum of viscous dynamics. This result contains that of the quantum theory as a special case. The uncertainty relation of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation is the same as that in quantum mechanics as is discussed in Appendix A. As is discussed in Ref. [7], to reproduce the Gross-Pitaevskii equation, we should set $\mu = 0, \kappa = \nu^2$ and $\nu = \hbar/(2m)$ [33]. Then the above uncertainty relation obtained from SVM is reduced to

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}\Delta_{\mathbf{p}} \geq d\frac{\hbar}{2}. \tag{46}$$

This is the well-known Kennard inequality. Therefore our uncertainty relation is the natural generalization of the result in quantum mechanics to SVM formulation of a viscous fluid. See also the discussions in Appendix B and Ref. [21].

Note that the lower bound of the uncertainty relation of viscous dynamics is different from that of quantum mechanics, because the lower bound is influenced by the magnitude of the viscous coefficient (kinetic viscosity) μ. And mathematically speaking, this lower bound can be smaller than that of quantum mechanics depending on these parameters, (κ, μ).

However, it should be emphasized that the right hand side of Eq. (44) does not vanishes, because the momenta $\mathbf{p}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ can be defined through the Legendre transform only when $\det\, M$ is finite. In short, when the momentum can be defined, the above uncertainty relation always has a finite lower bound.

In quantum mechanics, the Gaussian particle distribution gives the minimum uncertainty state. However, this is not true for viscous dynamics. See Appendix C for detail.

IV. APPLICATION TO DISSIPATIVE ACTION

So far, we have discussed the case where dissipative dynamics is obtained as a consequence of noise applied to a classical action (13), but it is also possible to consider an irreversible process where the dissipative effect already appears in classical dynamics. Here we consider the following classical equation of motion

$$m\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathbf{x} + \gamma\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{x} + \nabla V(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \tag{47}$$

where V is the potential energy and γ is the dissipative coefficient. This is a typical dissipative equation in classical mechanics and the energy (although its definition is not trivial [16]) is not conserved. We want to know the quantum version corresponding to this classical equation. Such an equation sometimes appears in a phenomenological model for a collective motion of a quantum system such as nuclei. The dissipative term which induces the energy dissipation can be associated with the decay width of the collective excitation mode [23].

In fact, there are various attempts for this problem. Kanai, for example, considered the following classical Lagrangian [18],

$$L = e^{\gamma t}\left[\frac{m}{2}\left(\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt}\right)^2 - V(\mathbf{x})\right], \tag{48}$$

which leads to the following classical canonical momentum,

$$\mathbf{p}_{kanai} = m\dot{\mathbf{x}}e^{\gamma t}. \tag{49}$$

From the usual procedure of the canonical quantization, this Lagrangian may be quantized by employing the following commutation relation,

$$[\hat{x}^i, \hat{p}^j_{kanai}] = i\hbar\delta_{ij}, \tag{50}$$

or

$$\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{kanai} = -i\hbar\nabla, \tag{51}$$

where $\hat{}$ denotes an operator. Then, the quantized Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}e^{-\gamma t}\nabla^2 + V(\mathbf{x})e^{\gamma t}. \tag{52}$$

However, it is known that this quantized dissipative equation has a problem for the uncertainty relation [16]. The uncertainty relation of this dissipative equation is given by

$$\sqrt{\langle\mathbf{x}^2\rangle - \langle\mathbf{x}\rangle^2}\sqrt{\langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}^2_{kanai}\rangle - \langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{kanai}\rangle^2} \geq d\frac{\hbar}{2}. \tag{53}$$

Here $\langle\ \rangle$ means the usual expectation value by the wave function calculated with the quantized Hamiltonian (52). Note that the definition of $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{kanai}$ contains an exponential amplification factor. Thus if we define a physical momentum operator by $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{phys} = e^{-\gamma t}\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{kanai}$ [16, 17] and re-calculate the uncertainty for this momentum, we obtain

$$\sqrt{\langle \mathbf{x}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^2}\sqrt{\langle \hat{\mathbf{p}}^2_{phys} \rangle - \langle \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{phys} \rangle^2} \geq d\frac{\hbar}{2}e^{-\gamma t}. \tag{54}$$

That is, the uncertainty disappears asymptotically in time for Kanai's theory. This vanishing uncertainty is considered to be a fundamental problem of the quantization the classical dissipative systems [16, 17, 20].

In this section, however, we will discuss another quantized dissipative equation, which was proposed by Kostin [15, 16, 24]. To obtain his equation, Kostin identified the *mechanical* (not *canonical*) momentum $m\, d\mathbf{r}/dt$ with the momentum operator $-i\hbar\nabla$. He further added a new potential term to his Hamiltonian, whose form is defined so as to reproduce the classical equation of motion (47) for the averaged equation. In other word, he obtained his equation by assuming the Ehrenfest theorem. However, the mechanical momentum is not the canonical momentum in this case and hence the consistency of this quantization is not trivial, although the reasonable behaviors are observed for the special solution of this equation.

Later, Misawa applied SVM to the Lagrangian (48) and obtained the Kostin equation [9]. In Kostin's phenomenological derivation, the Lagrangian was not used explicitly and hence the uncertainty relation for the canonical momentum could not be discussed. Here we re-derive the Kostin equation based on the Hamiltonian formulation of SVM and discuss the uncertainty relation of the Kostin equation.

Following Ref. [9], we consider the following the stochastic Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L} = e^{\gamma t}\left[m\frac{(D\mathbf{x})^2 + (\tilde{D}\mathbf{x})^2}{4} - V(\mathbf{x}) \right]. \tag{55}$$

Differently from the discussions in the previous section, we consider the one-particle system. The stochastic Hamiltonian for one particle system is defined by

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}\cdot D\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\mathbf{p}}\cdot \tilde{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{x} - \mathcal{L}, \tag{56}$$

where, from the definition of the Legendre transform, the momenta are

$$\mathbf{p} \; = \; e^{\gamma t} m D\mathbf{x} = e^{\gamma t} m\mathbf{u}, \tag{57}$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{p}} \; = \; e^{\gamma t} m \tilde{D}\mathbf{x} = e^{\gamma t} m\tilde{\mathbf{u}}. \tag{58}$$

Note that the consistency condition between $\mathbf{u}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$, Eq. (9), is not changed even for the one-particle case discussed here [7].

By applying SVM in the Hamiltonian form as was done in the previous section, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r},t) - e^{-\gamma t}\frac{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r},t)}{m} &= 0, \qquad (59)\\
\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{r},t) - e^{-\gamma t}\frac{\bar{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{r},t)}{m} &= 0, \qquad (60)\\
E\left[\frac{1}{2}\tilde{D}\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x},t) + \frac{1}{2}D\bar{\mathbf{p}}(\mathbf{x},t) + e^{\gamma t}\nabla V(\mathbf{x})\right]_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{r}} &= 0. \qquad (61)
\end{aligned}$$

By eliminating $\mathbf{p}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$, we obtain

$$(\partial_t + \mathbf{u}_m\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u}_m - 2\nu^2\nabla\left(\rho^{-1/2}\nabla^2\rho^{1/2}\right) = -\gamma\mathbf{u}_m - \frac{1}{m}\nabla V. \qquad (62)$$

The definition of $\mathbf{u}_m$ is the same as before. The first term on the right hand side is the new term which is induced by the exponential factor introduced in the Lagrangian.

To obtain the equation for the wave function, we introduce the phase as $\nabla\theta = \mathbf{u}_m/(2\nu)$. By combining the Fokker-Planck equation of ρ, we find

$$i\partial_t\psi(\mathbf{x},t) = \left[-\nu\nabla^2 + \frac{1}{2\nu m}V(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{i}{2}\gamma\ln\frac{\psi^*(\mathbf{x},t)}{\psi(\mathbf{x},t)} + a(t)\right]\psi(\mathbf{x},t), \qquad (63)$$

where $a(t)$ is an arbitrary time-dependent factor, which is set to zero in the derivation of the Schrödinger equation. When we choose $\nu = \hbar/(2m)$ and

$$a(t) = -\frac{i}{2}\gamma\langle\ln\frac{\psi^*}{\psi}\rangle, \qquad (64)$$

this equation is reduced to the Kostin equation. Here $\langle\ \ \rangle$ means the expectation value with the solution of the Kostin equation.

One can see that this is the non-linear equation and the solution of the Kostin equation does not have the property of the superposition principle. This is the main difference from the result by Kanai, where the equation of the wave function is still linear.

By using the momenta defined above, we can discuss the uncertainty relation for the Kostin equation. We already know the definition of the uncertainty of momentum from Eq. (42). Substituting our definitions of the momentum to this equation, we obtain

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}\Delta_{\mathbf{P}} \geq d\frac{\hbar}{2}e^{\gamma t}. \qquad (65)$$

Furthermore, by introducing the physical mean-deviation of the momentum by $\Delta_{\mathbf{P}_{phys}} = e^{-\gamma t}\Delta_{\mathbf{P}}$ as was done before, we have

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}\Delta_{\mathbf{P}_{phys}} \geq d\frac{\hbar}{2}. \tag{66}$$

One can see that, differently from the equation obtained by Kanai, the uncertainty relation of the Kostin equation does not disappear even in the asymptotic limit of time. In this sense, the Kostin equation is more promising quantum dissipative equation than that of Kanai.

The properties of the Kostin equation has been studies by several groups. The special solutions are discussed in Ref. [16, 25] and the applications to various phenomena in nuclear and condensed matter physics are shown in Ref. [26]. As a review paper for the various formulations of dissipative quantum equation including the Kostin equation, see Ref. [16].

This derivation is easily extended to the continuum media. Let us consider the introduction of quantum dissipation to the Gross-Pitaevskii equation by using the following stochastic Lagrangian density,

$$\mathcal{L} = e^{\gamma t}\rho_0^m \left[\frac{1}{4}\left\{(D\mathbf{r}(t))^2 + (\tilde{D}\mathbf{r}(t))^2\right\} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho^m}\right]. \tag{67}$$

where, to reproduce the Gross-Pitaevskii equation at $\gamma = 0$, we choose

$$\varepsilon = V(\mathbf{x})\frac{\rho^m}{m} + \frac{1}{2}U_0\frac{(\rho^m)^2}{m^2}. \tag{68}$$

Here $V(\mathbf{x})$ is an external potential and U_0 represents the strength of interaction.

By applying SVM and set $\nu = \hbar/(2m)$, we obtain the Gross-Pitaevskii equation with dissipation,

$$i\hbar\partial_t\psi = \left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2 + V + U_0|\psi|^2 + \frac{i\hbar\gamma}{2}\ln\frac{\psi^*}{\psi} + a(t)\right]\psi. \tag{69}$$

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, by extending the stochastic variational method formulated in the Lagrangian form into the Hamiltonian one, we examined the uncertainty relations for irreversible dynamics. We found that both of viscous dynamics and quantum dissipative processes have non-vanishing lower bound for the product of the uncertainties of position and momentum, as far as we can define the two stochastic momenta. Naturally our result reproduces the usual Kennard inequality in quantum mechanics as a special case.

Mathematically speaking, the existence of the finite lower bound of the uncertainty relation is trivial from the definition of the momenta. Because of the consistency condition (9), the definition of momentum contains $\nabla \ln \rho$. If we reduce the uncertainty $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}$ by considering the extremely concentrated fluid, it gives rise to the large gradient of ρ, leading to large $\Delta_{\mathbf{p}}$.

The significance of the present work will be more clear in the discussion of dissipative quantum physics. When we consider that SVM is an alternative method for quantization, the definition of momentum proposed here can be used to check the consistency of the quantization by calculating the uncertainty relation, as is the case of quantum dissipative dynamics. As such an example, we applied SVM to the classical dissipative equation, Kostin's quantum dissipative equation was obtained. Usually, this equation is derived from a phenomenological argument and the uncertainty relation of this quantized system is not trivial. Using our definition of momentum, we showed that this equation has a finite uncertainty relation, differently from other quantization theories of dissipative processes, for example, by Kanai.

In our approach, a condition for parameters in SVM (40) was found by employing the positivity of the kinetic energy. As a result, the correction term to the Navier-Stokes equation inevitably appears. The modification of the Navier-Stokes equation is one of the current topics [28], and our argument may justify such a modification. Recently, the equivalent correction term to the Navier-Stokes equation was reproduced with a different phenomenological argument [22]. We believe that it is quite important to check experimentally if the correction term exists and the relation (40) is always satisfied in Nature or not.

Another interesting aspect of the Hamiltonian form of SVM is that it may allow to define the positive-definite phase space distribution in quantum mechanics. The corresponding object in the usual quantum mechanics is considered to be the well-known Wigner function. However, this is not positive definite and does not have a precise meaning as a particle distribution function. To circumvent this difficulty, there are several proposals [27]. On the other hand, in the present approach, the stochastic trajectory is defined by $\mathbf{r(t)}$, $\mathbf{p(t)}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}(t)$. When we characterizes the phase space of quantum physics with these three variables, the new phase space distribution is given by

$$f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{P},\overline{\mathbf{P}};t) \equiv E[\delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{r}(t))\delta(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{P}(t))\delta(\overline{\mathbf{P}}-\bar{\mathbf{p}}(t))]. \tag{70}$$

This distribution is positive definite by definition. The relation between this definition and the Wigner is under investigation.

In this paper, we have considered that SVM gives a systematic method to treat the physics of fluctuation, and described the Schrödinger and Navier-Stokes equations on an equal footing. However, to unify the fields of quantum mechanics and hydrodynamics, there are still various unsolved problems. For the case of the Navier-Stokes equation, the origin of noise is attributed to the microscopic motion of constituent particles and the magnitude of the noise ν depends on temperature and the properties of constituent particles of fluids. On the other hand, we do not know what is the origin of the noise in the Schrödinger equation and why the magnitude is given by the constant $\nu = \hbar/(2m)$. As a quantization method, several aspects has not yet been established in SVM. For example, it is not known how to introduce the difference of statistics for identical particles, boson and fermion. Moreover, the quantization of the phase of the wave function pointed out by Ref. [13] is still an open question.

In the present investigation, we introduced momenta through the Legendre transform and we did not consider any essential modification of formulation of SVM. However, it may be possible to construct the stochastic calculus not in the configuration space but in the phase space. Such extension of SVM including the momentum variable is discussed in Sec. 3 of Ref. [3], and mentioned in Ref. [4]. Our result may be reproduced as a special case of this general approach.

The application to finite temperature systems is another interesting problem. The application of SVM to the finite temperature cases has not yet been known, but there is already an application of Nelson's stochastic quantization to finite temperature and the uncertainty relation is also discussed [29].

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the financial support by CNPq, FAPERJ, CAPES and PRONEX. Kodama expresses his thanks to the hospitality extended by Profs. H. Stöcker, D. Rischke and M. Bleicher.

Appendix A: uncertainty for the Gross-Pitaevskii equation

Usually, the Gross-Pitaevskii equation was derived by applying the mean-field approximation of the quantized boson field, where the commutation relation is given by

$$[\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{x},t), \hat{\phi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}',t)] = \delta(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'). \tag{A1}$$

The position and momentum operators in the quantum field theory are, respectively, defined by

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \int d^3\mathbf{x}\hat{\phi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x},t)\mathbf{x}\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{x},t), \tag{A2}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \int d^3\mathbf{x}\hat{\phi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x},t)(-i\hbar\nabla)\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{x},t), \tag{A3}$$

and lead to the following commutation relation,

$$[\hat{x}^i, \hat{p}^j] = i\hbar\delta_{ij}\int d^3\mathbf{x}\hat{\phi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x},t)\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{x},t). \tag{A4}$$

Then the uncertainty relation is

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}\Delta_{\mathbf{p}} \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}d, \tag{A5}$$

where we used the following definitions,

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{\langle\hat{\mathbf{x}}^2 - \langle\hat{\mathbf{x}}\rangle^2}, \tag{A6}$$

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{1}{\int d^3\mathbf{x}\langle\hat{\phi}^\dagger\hat{\phi}\rangle}\sqrt{\langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}^2\rangle - \langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle^2}. \tag{A7}$$

Here $\langle\ \rangle$ denotes the expectation value with a state in the Fock space. The definition of the mean-deviation of momentum per particle is defined with the normalization factor which gives the total number of the system.

Appendix B: relation to quantum mechanics

We will show that Eq. (44) is equivalent to the uncertainty relation in quantum mechanics. First we find in quantum mechanics,

$$\langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}^2\rangle = \int d^3\mathbf{x}\psi^*\hat{\mathbf{p}}^2\psi = \langle\hbar^2(\nabla R)^2 + (\nabla S)^2\rangle, \tag{B1}$$

where $\langle\ \rangle$ represents the expectation value with the wave function $\psi = e^{R-iS/\hbar}$ with the real functions R and S.

On the other hand, Eq. (9) is re-expressed as

$$\mathbf{u} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = 2\frac{\hbar}{m}\nabla R. \tag{B2}$$

From the Fokker-Planck equation, the probability current density is expressed as

$$\frac{\hbar}{2im}[\psi^*\nabla\psi - (\nabla\psi)^*\psi] = \psi^*\psi\mathbf{u}_m. \tag{B3}$$

Then we find the following relation,

$$\mathbf{u}_m = \frac{\mathbf{u} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}}{2} = \frac{1}{m}\nabla S. \tag{B4}$$

From these results, we can show that

$$\frac{1}{2}E[(m\mathbf{u})^2 + (m\tilde{\mathbf{u}})^2] = \langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}^2\rangle, \tag{B5}$$

and

$$E[m\mathbf{u}] = E[m\tilde{\mathbf{u}}] = \frac{1}{m}\langle\nabla S\rangle = \langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle. \tag{B6}$$

Summarizing these results, we find

$$(\Delta_{\mathbf{p}})^2 = \langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}^2\rangle - \langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle^2 = \frac{E[(m\mathbf{u})^2] - (E[m\mathbf{u}])^2}{2} + \frac{E[(m\tilde{\mathbf{u}})^2] - (E[m\tilde{\mathbf{u}}])^2}{2}. \tag{B7}$$

For the case of quantum mechanics where $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (0, 1/2)$ and $\nu = \hbar/(2m)$, we have $\mathbf{p} = m\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{p} = m\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$. Therefore the above result is equivalent to Eq. (42).

Appendix C: minimum uncertainty state

In quantum mechanics, the Gaussian wave packet is a state which gives the minimum value of the uncertainty relation. However, this is not true any more for the case of viscous dynamics. Let us consider the case where the mass density ρ^m has a Gaussian form and there is no macroscopic flow $\mathbf{u}^m = 0$. When we calculate the fluctuations $E[(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}})^2]$ and $E[(\Delta_{\mathbf{p}})^2]$ directly from the definitions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{E[(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}})^2]}\sqrt{E[(\Delta_{\mathbf{p}})^2]} &= m\nu\sqrt{4\alpha_1^2(1/2+\alpha_2)^2 + 4\alpha_2^2}\sqrt{E[(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}})^2]}\sqrt{E[(\nabla\ln\rho)^2]} \\ &= md\sqrt{\mu^2 + \kappa^2/\nu^2},\end{aligned} \tag{C1}$$

where we used

$$\sqrt{E[(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}})^2]}\sqrt{E[(\nabla \ln \rho)^2]} = d. \tag{C2}$$

One can see that the right hand side of Eq. (C1) coincides with that of Eq. (44) when, for example, $\alpha_1 = 0$ or $\alpha_2 = 1/2$ is satisfied. This condition is satisfied for the quantum mechanical limit, but not true for the Navier-Stokes equation where $\alpha_1 \neq 0$ and $\alpha_2 = 0$. In this case, Eq. (C2) is larger than the right hand side of Eq. (44). This is easily seen even from Eq. (44), where it is better to have a finite value for $E[(\mathbf{r} - E[\mathbf{r}]) \cdot (\mathbf{u}_m - E[\mathbf{u}_m])]$ to achieve the minimum uncertainty when $\mu \neq 0$.

We should take account that this condition seems to be satisfied for the case of the Euler equation where $\alpha_1 = 0$ and $\alpha_2 = 0$. However, we have $\det M = 0$ in this parameter set, and we cannot discuss the uncertainty relation in this case. On the other hand, if we allow to keep the quantum potential term to the Euler equation, we can discuss the uncertainty relation, which is given by

$$\sqrt{E[(\Delta_{\mathbf{x}})^2]}\sqrt{E[(\Delta_{\mathbf{p}})^2]} \geq md\frac{|\kappa|}{\nu}. \tag{C3}$$

In this case, the minimum uncertainty state is given by the Gaussian mass density. This is, however, a trivial result because it was known that the Schrödinger equation can be re-expressed in the form of the Euler equation with the quantum potential term, as was mentioned in the introduction.

[1] K. Yasue, J. Funct. Anal. **41**, 327 (1981); F. Guerra and L. M. Morato, Phys. Rev. **D27**, 1774 (1983); M. Pavon, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 6774 (1995); M. Nagasawa, *Stochastic Process in Quantum Physics*, (Birkhäuser, 2000).

[2] M. Davidson, Lett. Math. Phys. **3**, 271 (1979); J. C. Zambrini, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **24**, 277 (1985); H. Hasegawa, Phys. Rev. **D33**, 2508 (1986); R. Marra, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 1724 (1987); T. Misawa, Phys. Rev. **A40**, 3387 (1989); M. T. Jaekel, J. Phys. **A23**, 3497 (1990); M. Arnaudon and A. B. Cruzeiro, arXiv:1004.2176.

[3] J. Cresson and Sébastien Darses, J. Math. Phys. **48**, 072703 (2007).

[4] M. Pavon, Phys. Lett. **A209**, 143 (1995).

[5] E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. **150**, 1079 (1966); *Quantum Fluctuations*, (Princeton Univ. Press, Prinston, NJ, 1985).

[6] T. Koide and T. Kodama, arXiv:1105.6256.

[7] T. Koide and T. Kodama, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 45, 255204 (2012).

[8] Loffredo M I and Morato L M, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 40 8709 (2007).

[9] T. Misawa, Phys. Rev. **A40**, 3387 (1989).

[10] T. Misawa and K. Yasue, J. Math. Phys. 28, 2569 (1987).

[11] T. Misawa, J. Math. Phys. 29, 2178 (1988).

[12] E. Madelung, Z. Phys. **40**, 322 (1926); D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **85**, 166 (1952).

[13] T. Takabayashi, Prog. Theore. Phys. **8**,143 (1952); *ibid.* **9**, 187 (1953); T. C. Wallstrom, Found. Phyd. Lett. **2**, 113 (1989); Phys. Rev. **A49**, 1613 (1994).

[14] P. R. Holland, *The Quantum Theory of Motion: An Account of the de Broglie-Bohm Causal Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, 1995); D. Dürr and S.Teufel, *Bohmian Mechanics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009).

[15] M. D. Kostin, J. Chem. Phys. **57**, 3589 (1972); J. Stat. Phys. **12**, 145 (1975).

[16] H. Dekker, Phys. Rep. **80**, 1 (1981); R. W. Hasse, J. Math. Phys. **16**, 2005 (1975).

[17] W. E. Brittin, Phys. Rev. **77**, 396 (1950); P. Havas, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. **1**, 337 (1956); Nuovo Cimento Suppl. **3**, 363 (1950); IU. R. Senitzky Phys. Rev. **119**, 670 (1960).

[18] E. Kanai, Prog. Theor. Phys. **3**, 440 (1948).

[19] A. Sanin and A. A. Smirnovsky, Phys. Lett. **A372**, 21 (2007).

[20] P. Hänggi and G. -L. Ingold, Chaos **15**, 026105 (2005).

[21] D. de Falco, S. De Martino and S. De Siena, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 181 (1982).

[22] S. K. Dadzie and J. M. Reese, arXiv:1202.3169

[23] For example, see W.D. Myers, et al, Phys. Rev. C15, 2032 (1977) and K.H. Hagino, G.F. Bertsch and C. Guet, Nucl. Phys. A731, 347 (2004)

[24] D. S̈ussmann, Seminar Talhk at Los Alamos (1973); K. Albrecht, Phys. Lett. **B56**, 127 (1975).

[25] K.-K. Kan and J. J. Griffin, Phys. Lett. **B50**, 241 (1974); J. D. Immele, K.-K. Kan and J. J. Griffin, Nucl. Phys. **A241**, 47 (1975),

[26] J. J. Griffin and K.-K. Kan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **48**, 467 (1976); D. de Falco and D. Tamascelli, Phys. Rev. **A 79**, 012315 (2009),

[27] See, for example, M. Hillery, R. F. O'connell, M.O. Scully and E.P. Wigner, Phys. Rep. 106,

121 (1984).

[28] H. Brenner, Int. J. Eng. Sci., 54 67 (2012).

[29] K. Kobayashi and Y. Yamanaka, Phys. Lett. A 375, 3243 (2011).

[30] In principle, it is also possible to consider the higher order non-linear terms which will vanish in the classical limit, but we do not consider this possibility in this work.

[31] Exactly speaking, the second coefficient of viscosity vanishes in the present result. To have a finite value, we have to consider the entropy dependence in the internal energy density. See Refs. [6, 7] for details.

[32] This can be easily proven from the fact that for an arbitrary real parameter λ, we should have $E[(\mathbf{A}+\lambda\mathbf{B})^2] \geq 0$.

[33] To reproduce the Schrödinger equation, we should repeat the same argument starting from the one-particle Lagrangian as is done in Ref. [7] with these parameter values. We confirmed that the Kennard inequality is reproduced even in the quantum mechanical case. See also the discussion of the next section.